Approved For Release 2010/07/26 : CIA-RDP90-00494R001100710008-0

THE WASHINGTON POST
DATE 21 JAN. 85
PAGE E27

JACK ANDERSON

CIA Is Up to Old (Dirty) Tricks

Now and then, I have yielded to the temptation to make sport of the tribulations of the CIA, which has taken my jibes in ill humor.

In the case of Ronald Ray Rewald, for example, I got hold of suppressed documents that show the CIA's intrepid spies tripping over their cloaks and daggers.

Rewald was a CIA undercover man who faces criminal fraud charges in the collapse of his Honolulu-based investment firm. The less the public hears about the case, the more relieved the CIA will be.

So the CIA's paid obfuscators went tiptoeing into court and persuaded the judge to seal the embarrassing documents. The judge also placed the irrepressible Rewald under court order not to talk about his troubles.

I am one of those perverse reporters who is more intrigued than deterred when a government agency pulls down the blinds. So I dispatched my associates Indy Badhwar and Dale Van Atta to poke into the story.

Not long afterward, Rewald got a phone call from a man who claimed to be Badhwar. The caller insisted that Rewald explain some of the details of the story. This would have violated the court order and gotten Rewald into more trouble than he's already in. So Rewald hung up and phoned a confidant who could communicate with my office without being penalized by the court. The confidant was assured that Badhwar had not called Rewald.

My reporters became aware of other discomforting attentions, which indicated the CIA was lurking in the shadows. Not until I published a Rewald allegation that he had been asked by a CIA superior to take part in a drug-smuggling operation did the CIA come out of hiding.

On the day the story appeared, the CIA's public affairs director wrote me a cryptic note demanding that I turn over my sources to the CIA inspector general, the Justice Department and the two congressional intelligence committees. "If no such evidence is forthcoming," he wrote sternly, "we will assume that you have none."

My response was also cryptic: "I would be happy to exchange sources with the CIA any time," I wrote. Should the CIA decline to divulge its sources to me, though, I won't necessarily assume that it has none.

This isn't the first run-in I've had with the CIA. On an earlier occasion, my house was under surveillance by men with binoculars in parked cars, and I was conscious of being followed. It took a Senate committee to find out what was going on. It turned out that I was the "mudhen" in an illegal CIA surveillance called "Operation Mudhen."

At one point, the CIA had 18 radio cars following my reporters and me on our daily rounds. It also had an electronics team eavesdropping on our conversations and a photographic crew taking pictures of everyone going in and out of my office.

I understand that the CIA must stoop to occasional perfidies in plying its trade. But this doesn't give it the right to poison the judicial process. In matters that don't involve the security of the nation, maybe the time has come again to question the CIA's policy of suppression, intimidation and misrepresentation.

Approved For Release 2010/07/26 : CIA-RDP90-00494R001100710008-0